



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/748,455 | 12/30/2003 | Jeffrey D. Lindsay | KCX-733 (19668) | 2370 |
| 22827 | 7590 | 09/06/2007 | | |
| DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449 | | | EXAMINER MEHMOOD, JENNIFER | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2612 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/06/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

54

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/748,455 | LINDSAY, JEFFREY D. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jennifer A. Mehmood | 2612 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-14, 17-21, 23, 24, 27-30, 42-46 and 49-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 15, 16, 22, 25, 26, 31-41, 47 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:7/5/05;11/26/04;8/20/04;7/23/04 .

Election

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-4, 15, 16, 22, 25, 26, 31-41, 47, and 48 in the reply filed on August 23, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: Punctuation in two places – lines 5 and 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phipps (US 6,579,231).

Phipps discloses a body monitoring system comprising: at least one bio-sensor associated with a body and configured to generate sensor-data for at least one body-parameter (col 2, lns 32-42 and 58-62; col 3 lns 44-56; Fig. 1, item 16) a first computer associated with said body and configured to retrieve sensor- data from said at least one

bio-sensor (col 3, Ins 58-65; Fig. 1, item 14); a memory in communication with said first computer wherein said memory is configured to store sensor-data (Fig. 4, item 54; col 5, Ins 66, 67; col 6, Ins 1-7); said first computer further configured to generate treatment-signals and to transmit said treatment-signals to a treatment control system when said first computer determines that a body-parameter meets predefined treatment criteria (col 3, Ins 35-43; col 5, Ins 12-20 and 35); and said first computer further configured to automatically determine the proper treatment-signal format wherein said act of determining is based at least in part on treatment-control-system-information retrieved from said treatment control system (col 8, Ins 20-30; Fig. 5).

5. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phipps (US 6,579,231).

Phipps discloses a body and environment monitoring system comprising: at least one bio-sensor associated with a body and configured to generate sensor-data for at least one body-parameter (col 3, Ins 44-65; Fig. 1, items 12, 14, and 16); at least one electronic tag scanning device associated with said body and configured to receive electronic tag transmissions comprising environmental-data (col 3, Ins 66, 67; col 4, Ins 1); a first computer associated with said body and in communication with said at least one bio-sensor and said at least one electronic tag scanning device (col 3, Ins 61-62); said first computer configured to receive said sensor-data and said environmental-data (Fig. 3, items 60, 16); and a memory in communication with said first computer wherein said memory is configured to store said sensor-data and said environmental-data (Fig. 4, items 68, 70, 76, 78).

For claim 38, Phipps discloses said first computer further configured to generate treatment-signals and to transmit said treatment- signals to a treatment control system when said first computer determines that a body-parameter meets predefined treatment-criteria (col 5, Ins 12-35; Fig. 5); and said first computer further configured to automatically determine the proper treatment-signal format based at least in part on at least one of said environmental- data and treatment-control-system-information retrieved from said treatment control system (col 6, Ins 15-37).

For claim 39, Phipps discloses said treatment control system is at least one of a pharmaceutical treatment control system and a therapeutic treatment control system (col 5, Ins 12-35; Fig. 5; col 6, Ins 15-37).

For claim 40, Phipps discloses said treatment-signal is transmitted over at least one of a wired or wireless communication link (col 5, Ins 12-20; Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. (US 6,198,394), and further in view of Seroussi et al. (US 6,836,843).

For claim 1, Jacobsen discloses a body and environment monitoring system comprising: at least one bio-sensor associated with a body and configured to generate sensor-data related to at least one body-parameter (col 6, lns 1-5 and 21-37; Fig. 1, items 22, 24, 26, and 30); a first computer in communication with said at least one bio-sensor and configured to retrieve sensor-data from said at least one bio-sensor (col 5, lns 41-50; col 11, lns 51-67; col 12, lns 28-44; Fig. 5 and 5A, item 330); at least one electronic tag scanning device configured to retrieve environmental-data stored in electronic tags associated with items in an environment wherein said at least one electronic tag scanning device is one of (a) adapted to be mounted on said body, (b) adapted to be attached to said body and (c) adapted to be carried by said body; and memory for storing at least one of said sensor-data and said environmental-data (col 11, lns 28-45; Fig. 4A, items 300, 304, 306, 312). Jacobsen, however, does not disclose that the memory is at least one of a volatile and a non-volatile memory. Seroussi, on the other hand, does disclose a memory that is volatile and non-volatile (Fig. 2, items 32, 33; col 3, lns 35, 36; col 4, lns 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to disclose non-volatile and volatile memory so that data storage is either permanent or erasable, depending on a user's requirements.

For claim 2, Jacobsen discloses said environmental-data is at least one member from the group consisting of: (1) EMI Code; (2) item identification number; (3) item model number; (4) warning code; (5) room code; (6) floor code; (7) building code; (8) vehicle

code; (9) meal code and (10) nutrition code (col 10, Ins 1-14). The units are provided an item identification number.

For claim 3, Jacobsen discloses said first computer is configured to generate at least one of therapeutic treatment-signals and pharmaceutical treatment-signals when a monitored body- parameter meets predefined treatment-criteria (col 10, Ins 15-44).

For claim 4, Jacobsen discloses said at least one electronic tag scanning device is further configured to communicate with said first computer and to transfer at least part of said environmental-data to said first computer; and wherein said first computer is further configured to automatically determine the proper treatment-signal format using at least part of said environmental-data received from an electronic tag associated with a treatment- control system (col 9, Ins 58-67; col 10, Ins 15-46).

For claim 15, Jacobsen discloses said body is a human body (Fig. 1).

For claim 16, Jacobsen discloses said at least one body-parameter is at least one member from the group consisting of: (1) body temperature; (2) blood pressure; (3) heart rate; (4) blood sugar level; (5) blood oxygen level; (6) cholesterol level; (7) respiration rate; (8) hormone level; (9) galvanic skin response; (10) EMG; (11) EEG; (12) EOG; (13) body fat; (14) hydration level (15) activity level; (16) body position; (17) UV radiation exposure; and (18) UV radiation absorption (col 6, Ins 22-37).

8. Claim 22, 25, 26, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phipps (US 6,579,231), and further in view of Traxler (US 5,689,240).

For claim 22, Phipps discloses a monitoring system comprising: at least one electronic tag scanning device configured to transmit an electronic tag trigger signal and

Art Unit: 2612

to receive electronic tag transmissions (col 4, lns 6-27; Fig. 1, items 26, 12, 22); a first computer in communication with at least one electronic tag scanning device and configured to use said at least one electronic tag scanning device to retrieve environmental-data stored in electronic tags associated with items within an environment (col 3, lns 32-42, 66, 67; col 6, lns 15-22; Fig. 3, item 60); memory in communication with said first computer wherein said memory is at least one of a volatile memory and a non-volatile memory (col 6, lns 1-6); wherein said first computer stores retrieved environmental-data in said memory (Fig. 4, item 54); and wherein said first computer and said at least one electronic tag scanning device is at least one of (a) mounted on a body, (b) attached to a body, and (c) carried by a body (col 3, lns 44-56; Fig. 5). However, Phipps does not disclose wherein said first computer is further configured to use said at least one electronic tag scanning device to transmit an electronic tag trigger signal when a predefined amount of time elapses without a valid electronic tag transmission being received containing valid environmental-data. Traxler, on the other hand, discloses first computer is further configured to use said at least one electronic tag scanning device to transmit an electronic tag trigger signal when a predefined amount of time elapses without a valid electronic tag transmission being received containing valid environmental-data (col 1, lns 5-7; col 2, lns 34-46; col 5, lns 11-30). It would have been obvious to include transmitting an electronic tag trigger signal when a predefined amount of time elapses without a valid electronic tag transmission being received containing valid environmental-data to issue an alert about a preset distance violation.

For claim 25, Phipps discloses said first computer is in communication with a remote computer (col 4, lns 36-47; Fig. 1, item 18).

For claim 26, Phipps discloses said first computer is further configured to use said at least one electronic tag scanning device to transmit an electronic tag trigger signal according to transmit-criteria where said transmit-criteria is at least one member from the group consisting of: (1) periodically at set intervals; (2) periodically at random intervals; (3) upon manual request by a user; and (4) automatic request issued by said remote computer (col 4, lns 6-22 and 33-39).

For claim 31, Phipps discloses at least one bio-sensor associated with a body and configured to generate sensor-data for at least one body-parameter; and wherein said first computer is in communication with said at least one bio-sensor and configured to retrieve sensor-data from said at least one bio-sensor and to store said sensor-data in said memory (col 3, lns 44-65; col 4, lns 6-9; Figs. 3 and 4, item 54).

For claim 32, Phipps discloses said first computer is configured to automatically transmit treatment-signals when a monitored body-parameter meets predefined treatment-criteria (col 5, lns 12-20 and 28-35).

For claim 33, Phipps discloses said first computer is further configured to automatically format said treatment-signals based on environmental-data retrieved from electronic tags associated with a treatment control system near said body (col 5, lns 12-20 and 28-35; col 8, lns 17-30; Fig. 4, items 70, 72, 76 and 78).

For claim 34, Phipps discloses said first computer is further configured to accumulate reference data and wherein said display is further configured to display at

least one of said reference data, said environmental-data, real-time sensor-data, near real-time sensor-data, processed sensor-data and unprocessed sensor-data (col 5, lns 23-35; Fig 2, item 40).

For claim 35, Phipps discloses said sensor data is transmitted to a remote computer (Fig. 1, item 18; col 4, lns 24-29, 27-43).

9. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phipps (US 6,579,231), and further in view of Lye et al. (US 2004/0100376).

Phipps discloses an electronic scanning device, but not an RFID STR and wherein said electronic tag is an RFID smart tag. However, Lye discloses an RFID STR and an RFID smart tag (paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to include an RFID system of an RFID reader and an RFID tag to facilitate short range communication between the reader and the tag in order to avoid interference with other RF devices in close proximity to the RFID devices.

10. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traxler (US 5,689,240), and further in view of Gaukel (US 6,100,806).

For claim 47, Traxler discloses a method of tracking environmental-data comprising the steps of: configuring an electronic tag scanning device to listen for electronic tag transmissions; transmitting a trigger signal when no electronic-tag transmissions are received during a predefined period of time (col 1, lns 5-7; col 2, lns 34-46; col 5, lns 11-30). Traxler, however, does not disclose storing received environmental-data in time stamped memory. Gaukel, on the other hand, discloses storing received environmental-data in time stamped memory (col 6, lns 20-22 and 42-

48; col 15, lns 18-33; col 18, lns 60-64; col 19, lns 9-15). It would have been obvious to include environmental-data in a time stamped memory in order to create a histogram for future data analysis.

For claim 48, Traxler discloses the step of transmitting an electronic tag trigger signal according to predefined transmit-criteria (col 2, lns 42-57).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A Mehmood whose telephone number is (571) 272.2976. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Daniel Wu, can be reached at (571) 272.2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer A. Mehmood
August 28, 2007


BENJAMIN C. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER